

1. What is the time period Tetra Tech has worked at the Hunters Point Shipyard?

1A. Records are not readily available on the first day TTECI started working at Hunters Point, however, Tetra Tech is known to have worked on the environmental program at Hunters Point since the mid-1990s.

2. How many soil samples has Tetra Tech done during the entire period they've worked at the shipyard?

2A. Counting up all samples that TTECI has ever collected is over and above the amount of effort that can be addressed in this type of response. If this information is needed, please use the FOIA process to request it. Likely, reimbursement of government time will be required. You can find information on the FOIA process at [HYPERLINK "<https://www.foia.navy.mil>"]

3. How many of Tetra Tech's soil samples does the Navy believe were anomalous?

3A. 386 soil samples were identified as anomalous.

4. How many of the soil samples does the Navy believe were falsified?

4A. Investigations into the reasons for anomalous samples are on-going. It is the Navy's policy to not comment on on-going investigations.

5. How many of these samples and sites got retested? Who did the retesting? Did the Navy or another agency oversee the re-testing and if so, were split samples taken?

5A. Tetra Tech was required to resample 386 soil samples under close supervision by the Navy. Split samples were collected in accordance with site sampling procedures and analyzed by EPA/Navy approved laboratories.

6. What was the extent (if any) of contamination removed based on the falsified samples and where was that soil disposed of?

6A. Resampling of anomalous soil samples identified areas that required rework. Re-work in these areas has been completed and will be summarized in the Remedial Action Completion reports for Parcel C and Parcel E. These documents are expected to be submitted draft in November 2017 and April 2021, respectively.

Additional summarization of this information at this time is over and above the amount of effort that can be addressed in this type of response. If this information is needed, please use the FOIA process to request it. Likely, reimbursement of government time will be required. You can find information on the FOIA process at [HYPERLINK "<https://www.foia.navy.mil>"]

7. What are the current plans on the revetment wall in terms of size, scope and content of the wall and barriers? Has this plan incorporated the latest sea level rise projections? What are the projections you are basing this on? How is the Navy addressing and protecting the site from inundation under the landfill that may result from rising sea levels?

7A. The Navy evaluates sea level rise in our environmental documents and is required to ensure that our remedies will be protective in the long term. Projections are based on the best information when the documents are being written and protectiveness will be reviewed in perpetuity during the 5 year review process (i.e., if sea level rise starts to look to be a problem for our remedy, we will have to adjust).

Please see the following document for more information: [HYPERLINK

"http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/final_documents2.asp?global_id=38440005&doc_id=5005528"]

“Inundation under the landfill” is not a term that we use. Groundwater is being redirected around the Parcel E-2 landfill to protect groundwater from coming into contact with waste. The shoreline is being protected from potential sea level rise by several methods, as detailed in the above referenced document.